

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 9-17 remain pending in this application. Claim 9 has been amended to correct an informality noted by the examiner. An IDS in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) will be filed shortly.

### **The Office Action**

Claims 9, 10 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moore (No. 3,462,982), while claims 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Sholes (871,047). However, as set forth below, the pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Moore has one wheel rim hook carried on a lock member which is slidable along a flat ratchet bar. The lock member is slidable on the ratchet bar only in a radially outward direction unless an associated key lock is unlocked, eliminating the need for a manual key operation to secure the slidable rim hook in its radially outward position mounted on the steering wheel rim. Moore suffers, however, from several other disadvantages which render it highly impractical as an anti-theft device to be used on a daily basis by typical consumers and motorists. For example, the ratchet bar and connecting elements between the ratchet bar and the body of the steering wheel lock remain exposed. An additional disadvantage of Moore is that the elongated body member and the exposed ratchet bar are formed of flat bar stock. The rectangular cross-section of these members does not allow for relative rotation of the rim hooks about the axis of the elongated body member. In use, the preferred orientation of an installed steering wheel lock would be horizontally across the front of the steering wheel, and rotation of the hooks relative to one another may often be desirable to mount the hooks around wheel spokes which may join the rim at the horizontally opposed locations.

On the other hand, claim 9, as amended, provides for an anti-theft device that includes:

*"a body member telescopically receiving said bar member, a lock housing on said body member having a passage through which said bar member extends and a bore opening into said passage, a pawl in said bore, a spring biasing said pawl into engagement with said ratchet teeth, said pawl and said teeth being configured to allow said bar member to ratchet outwardly relative to said body member from a dismounted to a mounted condition relative to said control component while preventing said bar member from moving inwardly of said body member"*

Moore does not disclose or teach a body member *telescopically receiving* a bar member. Rather, Moore includes a clamp 20 that is welded to a slidable bracket 22, which simply *slides along* portion 12 of bar 10. That is, bracket 22 with lock 24 and clamp 20 affixed thereto is slid in an outward direction so that clamp 20 firmly engages portion 32 of the steering wheel. (See col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 5.) Further, Moore does not include integral construction of the lock housing with the body member, which presents no external pry points in which a criminal tool may be inserted. Accordingly, claim 9 is not anticipated by Moore and is thus allowable. Insofar as claims 10-17 depend from claim 9, they are allowable as well.

In regard to claims 13-16, Moore does not disclose or teach a bar member that is a solid round rod and a body member that is a round tube. Sholes discloses a clamp that includes a tubular post 1 and a movable jaw 3 and stem 4 fastened together, wherein the stem 4 has on it ratchet teeth 5 and fits loosely in the post 1. And a pawl 6 mounts on the post 1 and engages with the ratchet teeth 5. (See col. 1, lines 46-51.) However, there is no evidence of a motivation or suggestion in Moore that the flat bar 12 and slidable bracket 22 could be modified such that they comprise a round tube and solid round rod, respectively. Accordingly, claims 13-16 are allowable over the cited art for this additional reason.

## CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims remaining in the application (Claims 9-17) are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBERT V. VICKERS, Reg. No. 19,504  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
Phone (216) 861-5582  
Facsimile (216) 241-1666

9/22/84